



STRATEGIC PLANNING COUNCIL MINUTES

September 2, 2003

The regular meeting of the Palomar College Strategic Planning Council was held on Tuesday, September 2, 2003, in SU-18. The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m. by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador. Dr. Amador welcomed the members to the first meeting of the new school year. Each person introduced him/herself and the group they were representing. Notebooks were provided for new SPC members.

Roll Call

Members Present: Amador, Barkley, Barton, Bishop, Cater, Cuaron, Dimmick, Dowd, Drinan, Eberhart, Frady, Giese, Halttunen, Ivey, Jay, Madrigal, McCluskey, Miyamoto, Owens, Patton, Soto, Spear

Members Absent: Key, Magana, Wallenius

Guests Present: Barbara Baldrige

A. Minutes

MSC Bishop, Cater

The minutes of the meeting of May 20, 2003, were approved.

B. Action Items/Second Reading – There were none.

C. First Reading

1. 2003-04 Annual Implementation Plan

The group received copies and discussed the draft of the 2003-04 Annual Implementation Plan. (**Exhibit C-1**) This will be brought back for action at the September 16 meeting.

2. Template for Progress on AIP

Michelle Barton distributed copies of and discussed the Progress Report Template for Strategic Plan 2005, Annual Implementation Plan. (**Exhibit C-2**) Several suggestions for additions/revisions were made. Ms. Barton will include the recommended changes and send it to Barbara Baldrige for distribution. This document is intended for use by the primary person responsible for completing the AIP.

3. Student Learning Outcomes Task Force

Dr. Amador reported that the idea for this task force came out of this summer's work group. Because of the magnitude of all of this, institutionally, we are going to have to pull it together because the institution must ultimately develop the methodology and the measurements for accreditation. Steve Spear discussed the governance structure group request to form the Student Learning Outcomes Task Force. On the June 30 letter to the College from the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges, mention was made of the need to establish the institutional review process and the need to measure student learning outcomes. We have been doing student learning outcomes for years at the individual and department levels, but we have never integrated it into the review process and carried it out. Mr. Spear and Dr. Amador worked on the proposed request together (**Exhibit C-3**). This has been to the Faculty Senate last week, and they will be reviewing it again on September 15. It is anticipated that the Senate will request that the number of faculty members on the task force be increased.

Dr. Amador noted that this task force is not going to do all the institutional work for the next six years on learning outcomes. This is to structure it, to help us so that we know how we're going to do it. It is similar to taking an objective and defining it. An attempt has been made to capture the work that has already been done in this area by including persons on the task force from other areas/groups on campus who have been addressing this issue. We will need to tell the Accrediting Commission where we are with this issue via a status report in 2005.

This will be brought back for action at the September 16 meeting.

4. Flexible Multi-Year Budget Planning Ad Hoc Committee

Jerry Patton discussed the governance structure group request to form the Flexible Multi-Year Budget Planning Ad Hoc Committee. **(Exhibit C-4)** Following discussion, it was agreed that this should be an ad hoc committee under the Revenue Allocation Committee's jurisdiction.

5. Equipment Replacement Task Force

Jerry Patton discussed the governance structure group request to form the Equipment Replacement Task Force. **(Exhibit C-5)** Mr. Patton stated that he will probably need some suggestions and recommendations for members. The need for this task force was identified by recommendation number five in the accreditation report that we have a process to effectively identify and fund equipment replacement needs. That would encompass all kinds of equipment, including that which is not technology related. The equipment would need to be identified, its age determined, developing replacement criteria, and determining how we would pay for it. It was recommended that the membership of this task force be broader and that there be a co-chair so that it will not be perceived as being a resource allocation issue. It was also recommended that, as this covers a broad variety of equipment, there should be a commitment from the College to replace the products, leaving the decision of how to pay for them up to RAC.

Mr. Patton was asked if this task force would also consider the repair of equipment as this is a big expense in many areas. He stated that they would assess the equipment to determine whether additional repair or replacement would be appropriate. There also needs to be a process or mechanism to identify repair costs and identify where the funds are to come from. Judy Eberhart reported that some faculty members get professional development credit for repairing equipment in their areas.

Dr. Amador recommended that the task force look at the way the categorical funds are used to be certain they benefit the institution. Lynda Haltunen recommended that software be considered as an addition to this list. Mr. Patton stated that he and Berta Cuaron need to meet to discuss the two AIP items that relate to this. Dr. Amador suggested that, after Mr. Patton and Ms. Cuaron meet, it might be determined that a subcommittee dealing with only technology should be formed.

Steve Spear commented that, having just begun his fourth decade at this institution, this is the first time he has seen anyone actually bring up the concept of having a campus-wide organized equipment prioritization. However, he suspects there is equipment on campus that no one really knows is there. Mr. Patton noted that the value of equipment determines whether or not it is carried on the inventory. However, if equipment is being used and has value in the classroom, we need to be sure it is listed so that we can start the replacement process.

This will be brought back for action at the September 16 meeting.

6. Personal Printing Costs

Bonnie Dowd stated that she prefers to receive hard copies of the SPC agenda and minutes, rather than electronic copies, as she must print them out on her home printer or on her department's printer. She has requested that copies come from a district-wide source because it is wear and tear on her computers.

Dr. Amador noted that lengthy documents are always presented in hard-copy form at the meeting so that the council members do not have to print them. The agenda is usually not more than 1 or 2 pages, and the minutes 4 or 5 pages. In the past, members have requested that they receive the minutes electronically in order to save printing expenses. Mike Dimmick pointed out that if hard copies are made and council members have already printed their own, we would end up with a lot of extra copies. Chris Barkley suggested that those who want hard copies request them, and that number of copies could be made and brought to the meeting.

D. Discussion Items

1. 2003-04 Governance Document

The group received copies of the Palomar College Governance and Administrative Structure document. **(Exhibit D-1)** This document will be placed on the web site.

This summer, Dr. Amador prepared a compilation of all the committees from the last faculty manual, which was printed in 2001. She took the administrative organizational structure of the College and showed how it relates to the governance structure. Committees that do not show an asterisk (*) after their names on the table of contents have not been reviewed by SPC. In order to do so, the administrator identified by the governance chart should bring forward those committees with recommendations for approval as is or changes on a governance structure request form to SPC. Those committees identified as being "pending faculty contract" are not included in this group and will continue as is until the contract is finalized.

It would be good to have all these committees reviewed before the end of the fall semester. The document could then be revised and out before the spring semester begins.

Bonnie Dowd called attention to page 4 of the document which states, "Recommendations shall emerge ideally as a result of group consensus. When consensus cannot be reached, a majority of members shall determine the recommendation" and asked if all committees and councils are now required to vote. Dr. Amador pointed out that the wording was approved last year. Bruce Bishop pointed out that ideally, in a decision-making situation, consensus is the ideal thing. If everyone can agree to support a recommendation, that would be ideal. But absent the ability to get that consensus, we still need some kind of decision-making paradigm to take forward from that committee. Realizing that all councils on this campus are open so that, if the recommendation comes from one of the planning councils that this is what a majority of the people on this council agreed to, other members of that council who are in disagreement with it still have the option to appear at the next level and speak to the minority opinion. Otherwise, one person can stop a consensus from being reached, and no action can take place.

2. Evaluation of SPC and Governance

Michelle Barton presented and discussed the results of the 2002-03 Strategic Planning Council Self-Evaluation. **(Exhibit D-2)**

Dr. Amador stated that one of the things that came out of this is the fact that we are working toward something. People want to improve upon it, and that is very positive for an organization, given the fact that we have been doing this for only one year and had many setbacks with the budget reductions. Next year, when we do the evaluation of SPC again, the four planning councils need to do the same survey so that they may evaluate their own work.

3. Governance Training

Dr. Amador reported that it is important that members of SPC and the planning councils understand their roles. Half-hour training sessions will be given two or three different times toward the end of September or beginning of October – as soon as all the constituent groups have selected all of their representatives for the councils. Dr. Amador would like each of the group presidents to work with her and Michelle Barton to put together a training packet for their groups. She would like each of the organizations to indicate to the rest of the SPC members how their constituent group works in terms of the communication loop. We all need to understand each other's internal processes. When we discuss things here, we assume that it will be communicated to the constituency groups. But we need to make

sure that we are communicating with each other and that people are reporting back to their groups about what was said, discussed, need more information about, what the timelines are, and what we're working on in terms of the process. Dr. Amador will be calling the presidents of the organizations to meet with her and Ms. Barton to script out a lesson plan with the active involvement of each of the presidents or whomever they want to designate to be able to share their communication process of how they see this working. Everybody in SPC has representatives on the planning councils within the governance structure. Bonnie Dowd suggested including group dynamics and discussing the fact that change is difficult and to talk about the challenges with change. She also thinks it is important that "we agree to disagree" with respect and civility. The stating of one's opinion should not be taken as a personal attack.

Dr. Amador pointed out that, when we went through the strategic planning process, we spent a lot of time on those values regarding mutual respect and integrity. We do need to be concerned about that. Regarding comments to peers and colleagues – discussion is one thing; personal attack is a different issue – and that seems to be the strategy in some cases.

It is important that all members of all the planning councils understand each other's processes as they are not all the same. Dr. Amador asked the groups to agree to assign their members to the planning councils by the end of September or first of October so that the training may take place.

4. SPC Meeting Time

Jerry Patton suggested that a longer block of time be set aside for the SPC meetings so that we don't run out of time before the agenda is finished. This item will be put on the agenda for a November meeting for discussion to see if we can come up with a better grid.

E. Reports of Planning Councils

1. Administrative Services Planning Council

Jerry Patton reported that this council had taken a break over the summer but has now reconvened. They are starting to work on defining outcomes and benchmarks and tying them to the institutional review process. They are also looking at their action plans and getting ready for budget preparation for 04-05.

2. Human Resource Services Planning Council

Jack Miyamoto reported that this council has not met since the summer break but will meet next Tuesday, September 9.

3. Instructional Planning Council

Berta Cuaron reported that this council will have its first meeting of the new year next Wednesday, September 10.

4. Student Services Planning Council

Joe Madrigal reported that this council will have its first meeting of the new year next Wednesday, September 10.

F. Reports of Constituencies

1. Administrative Association – There was no report.

2. Associated Student Government

As Amador Soto had to leave the meeting early, Bruce Bishop reported on his behalf. The ASG election is going to be held the first week of October. ASG encourages all SPC members, all faculty and staff to encourage students they know that they think would be interested in student government to go to the Office of Student Affairs and get a packet to find out about the election and ideally stand for election. There are several positions open for the entire academic year.

The ASG had their first meeting of the school year last Wednesday. They seem like an enthusiastic group of students and are looking forward to a productive year. They will be attending a Student Leadership Conference October 17-19 in Sacramento.

ASG is looking forward to the grand opening of the Student Union on Thursday.

3. Confidential and Supervisory Team – There was no report.

4. CCE/AFT

Tricia Frady reported that four new officers were elected, effective July 1. There is currently one vacant position. The new executive council members are busily trying to get themselves organized.

5. Faculty Senate

Steve Spear reported that the Faculty Senate is working on the Learning Culture Task Force, which they have sent to one of their committees. They have reestablished the joint council between PFF and the Faculty Senate to work on the representation on committees for those positions that were not negotiated. They will be studying the criteria for the academic department assistants. They will bring back the Student Learning Outcomes Task Force at the next meeting.

6. PFF/AFT

Mary Ann Drinan reported that she will be attending a number of meetings this month.

G. Pending Items – There were none.

H. Other Items

Bruce Bishop asked everyone to attend the Grand Opening Ceremony of the Student Union on Thursday at 11 a.m.

I. Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:53 p.m.